

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT  
DIVISION FOUR

In re DEVON W., a Person Coming Under  
the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DEVON W.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A125398

(Solano County  
Super. Ct. No. J037736)

The juvenile court sustained an allegation that the minor committed one count of felony vandalism (Pen. Code, § 594, subd. (a)) when he scratched the car of a family friend. The minor was adjudged a ward of the court and placed on probation. He appeals from an order directing him to pay the victim restitution in the amount of \$3,938.37 for damage to her car. The minor's counsel has asked this court for an independent review of the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) After review of the record, we find no arguable issues and affirm.

The victim submitted a restitution claim form (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 730.6) requesting a total of \$4,400, and she attached a letter from her insurance company showing that it had paid her \$3,938.37 in comprehensive damages. The minor disputed the claim and requested a restitution hearing. He was present in court when a restitution hearing was scheduled for May 18, 2009. The minor did not appear at the May 18

hearing. The juvenile court found that the minor had received proper notice, and it ordered the minor to pay restitution for the portion of the victim's claim for which she had submitted supporting documentation.

The minor was represented by counsel and received a fair restitution hearing. The standard of review of a restitution order is abuse of discretion (*In re Dina V.* (2007) 151 Cal.App.4th 486, 490), and we find no abuse of discretion here.

The restitution order is affirmed.

---

Sepulveda, J.

We concur:

---

Reardon, Acting P.J.

---

Rivera, J.